

Ethnohistory in the Making: Guido Marlière and the Circulation of Knowledge about Jê Peoples of Minas Gerais, Brazil, 1760–1840

Judy Bieber, *University of New Mexico*

Abstract. This article analyzes the evolution of ethnographic texts written about Jê-speaking peoples of the interior of Minas Gerais, Brazil, from the 1760s through the 1830s. It interprets both the timing and content of these sources with reference to the emergence of Enlightenment thought, the development of a transatlantic community of letters, and the intervention of an idiosyncratic French military officer, Guido Marlière, who participated in Brazil's Botocudo War of 1808–31. Marlière's writing, informed by his long association with Jê peoples, mastery of their languages, and advocacy for more humane indigenous policy, was unprecedented in its cultural specificity. Marlière also contributed directly and indirectly to the production of canonical texts authored by European scientists. In this article, Bieber recovers Marlière's vivid, humanizing observations about Jê peoples and uses him as an example of how local actors contributed to the circulation of ideas and production of ethnographic knowledge.

Keywords. Jê peoples, Brazil, indigenous history, eighteenth century, nineteenth century

In this article I elucidate the timing and content of ethnographic texts about migratory, macro Jê speakers of Minas Gerais, Brazil, for whom the written record remained sparse and opaque through the end of the eighteenth century.¹ In comparison, missionaries and adventurers had documented coastal, semisedentary Tupi cultures from the mid-sixteenth century onward. The incorporation of Jê territories into church and state structures began only in the 1760s.² Subsequent territorial conquest and state-sponsored missions resulted in more written documentation about Jê speakers

recorded by Portuguese observers. However, soldiers, administrators, settlers, and priests tended to describe native peoples' characteristics only to the extent that they were potentially useful to Portuguese imperial objectives. Many of these interlocutors spoke native languages and possessed cultural knowledge necessary to negotiate alliances, trade goods or services, or effect religious conversion. Frustratingly for the historian, they seldom wrote ethnographically, limiting themselves to generic descriptors relevant to the fulfillment of their own bureaucratic mandates.

I also underscore the importance of Enlightenment thought and the development of a transnational scientific community in the emergence of Jê ethnographies. In particular, I highlight the writings of a military officer named Guido Marlière, who shaped conquest and indigenous policy in Jê territories in Minas Gerais in the 1810s and 1820s. His writings are notable in their detail and specificity. Published in ephemeral regional newspapers, they did not attain the canonical status of books published by European naturalists from the late 1810s onward. However, Marlière's voice is evident in many of these narratives as he facilitated outsider access to Jê communities. My goals are twofold: to recover his vivid, humanizing observations about Jê peoples and to use this case as an illustration of how the transatlantic circulation of people and ideas contributed to the production of ethnographic knowledge.

Early Texts and Contexts

Accompanying the first Portuguese governor in 1549 were Jesuit priests who devised procedures for catechizing Brazil's native peoples. Missionaries encountered dispersed populations of nonsedentary and semisedentary peoples and prioritized resettlement in centralized missions called *aldeias*. At European contact, coastal regions were dominated by Tupi-speaking semisedentary peoples that had displaced the more nomadic Jê speakers to the Brazilian interior.³ Facing possible enslavement by settlers, many Tupi speakers joined mission villages despite their strict labor regimes and sober European morals.⁴ Early representations of Brazilian natives were predominantly Tupi.⁵ Moreover, Tupi converts shaped Portuguese views about Jê-speaking Indians. They conflated linguistic difference with other pejorative traits, calling enemy Jê speakers Tapuias (twisted tongues) or Aimorés (evildoers or killers).⁶ Over time Europeans made increasingly hardened distinctions between Tupis and "Tapuias," despite having little to no direct contact with the latter. The two linguistic groups shared many cultural similarities, notably the practice of ritual cannibalism. However, Jê speakers emphasized foraging for subsistence, formed smaller groups, and

migrated more frequently. They remained largely isolated from Portuguese communities until the latter decades of the eighteenth century.

Within the linguistically ascribed ethnonyms of Tupi and Tapuia existed numerous subgroups. Portuguese settlers ascribed to Jê speakers residing in what is now eastern Minas Gerais and its contiguous borders of southern Bahia, western Espírito Santo, and northwestern Rio de Janeiro, the ethnonyms Coroado, Coropó, Puri, Pataxó, Monoxó, Maxakali, Malali, Makoni, Krenak, Kamaká-Mongoio, Naknenuk, Tocoio, and Gren or Gueren, among others.⁷ In the latter half of the eighteenth century, Jê peoples were more commonly and generically identified as heathens (*gentios*) or as Puris, Aimorés, or Botocudos, so named for the practice of wearing *botoques*, large wooden disks inserted in the earlobes and lower lips.

The discovery of gold in the mid-1690s in what is now Minas Gerais decisively altered the lives of these indigenous peoples. Previously, there had been little economic incentive for the Crown to establish a formal presence inland, especially given the transportation barriers posed by its challenging topography. Sporadic contact with the Portuguese had taken place in the form of *bandeiras*, expeditions sanctioned by the Crown to explore the interior, to seek out mineral discoveries, and to acquire indigenous captives. While their episodic forays could be devastating to the natives they encountered, their activities did not result in permanent structural changes to indigenous populations as a whole.⁸ However, prospectors aggressively enslaved native peoples to work in the mines.⁹ This period of exploitation was brief; within a few decades miners transitioned to African or Afro-Brazilian slaves.¹⁰ Most towns clustered around Vila Rica and Mariana, the administrative and ecclesiastical capitals of the mining district. Jê speakers dominated the principal river basins to the east, in large measure because the Portuguese Crown prohibited settlement there and depended on the natives' reputation as cannibals to deter contrabandists. However, local officials periodically violated Crown policy and permitted Portuguese subjects to penetrate the backlands (*sertões*) to pursue military and economic objectives.¹¹ By the mid-eighteenth century, with gold yields on the decline, Crown authorities increasingly came to sanction violence against indigenous peoples in order to claim new lands for settlement, trade, and mining. A more sustained documentary record of Jê peoples accompanied this renewal of conquest.

Conquerors and Catechists

During the 1760s, a series of *mineiro* (of Minas Gerais) governors promoted the formal "conquest" of Jê-dominated territories including Cuieté

(1765), Casca (1769), and Arrepiados (1781). They authorized the creation of militarized hamlets to “pacify” the “wild untamed heathen” and to facilitate permanent Portuguese settlements.¹² Not surprisingly, Crown authorities described native peoples from the perspectives of military conquest or religious conversion, using inflammatory rhetoric to justify violent force against native “assaults,” “invasions,” and “infestations.” However, military reports from Cuieté document few indigenous instigators. In confrontations with soldiers, Jê peoples typically fared badly, suffering disproportionate casualties and the loss of surviving women and children to Portuguese captors.¹³

Contrary to alarmist discourse that spoke of a “great multiplicity of heathens” that constituted an “immense” threat, native peoples were dispersed widely.¹⁴ Extrapolating from the number of native casualties reported in various conflicts, a group size of 40–80 seems likely. They were skilled trackers and foragers and easily outpaced Portuguese soldiers.¹⁵ Jê tribes often established seasonal camps in predictable locations, typically near the headwaters of rivers and streams. A handful of native villages were more permanent, among them, Laranjeiras, located at the confluence of the Doce and Suaçuí Rivers, three to four days walking distance from Cuieté. It housed 139 Monoxós, Kumanoxós, Maxakalis, Panhames, and Kutaxós, 113 of them women and children.¹⁶

A number of Portuguese *bandeirantes* (expeditionaries engaging in prospecting and native conquest) took credit for the “pacification” of this blended community, but it most likely originated with a Portuguese prospector named João da Silva Guimarães, who explored the *sertões* to the east of the town of Bom Sucesso das Minas Novas during the 1730s and 1740s.¹⁷ He established enduring relationships with Jê peoples, and at the time of his death it was said that he “governed” several Jê villages along the São Mateus River.¹⁸ His son, a mulatto corporal named Alexandre da Silva Guimarães, served at the Conquest of Cuieté and his status was sufficient to mobilize indigenous warriors from Laranjeiras and a nearby Makoni settlement to assist the Portuguese in various engagements against “Boto-cudos.” Local authorities went so far as to claim that Alexandre’s authority among native groups outweighed the king’s and cited a Makoni group’s solicitation of his advice in the selection of a successor to their aged chief. Unfortunately the documentation reveals neither their motives nor Alexandre’s recommendation. Moreover, neither father nor son wrote about these native allies as individuals or cultures, emphasizing instead their willingness to accept Catholicism and to form alliances against mutual enemies.¹⁹

While the absence of ethnographic detail in these accounts is frustrating, it is not surprising. There would be little reason for rustic paramilitaries and

soldiers to expand their representations of native peoples beyond their conformity to Portuguese social, economic, and administrative norms. Missionaries similarly confined their observations to imperial objectives. For example, Vicar Manuel Vieira Nunes, who spent a few years at Laranjeiras, claimed the *aldeados* (residents of aldeias) had limited capacity for permanent settlement, military alliances, and Christian conversion.²⁰ He baptized only a few adults and celebrated even fewer native marriages.²¹ Nunes found their constant demands for food and trade goods irksome, not recognizing the importance of these gift exchanges to their alliance.²² Deeming the Botocudos even more barbaric than Africans, he advocated for their enslavement under the principle of just war, a suggestion that would be adopted as Crown policy in 1808.²³

Padre Francisco da Silva Campos worked among Pataxó Indians at the Conquest of Casca and with Coroados and Puris in the native parish of São João Batista in the *mineiro* southeast.²⁴ He characterized native peoples as “wretched ones, miserable and disgraced victims of error,”²⁵ “forest wanderers intermingled with wild beasts,”²⁶ vice-ridden, sexually indiscriminate, and lacking in initiative or discernment. In one letter, he pontificated:

The Tapuia of Brazil is perhaps of all of the savages known, the most stupid and primitive. He is born of a mild climate that does not oblige him to fight the cold, finding easy subsistence in the spontaneous fruits of nature, in the hunt, and in fishing. His industry appears limited to simple physical necessity; it is impossible to oblige him to work for that he does not need to live. The greatest difficulty in their education is to inspire love for the commodities of life and inculcate in their souls the true pleasures and love of property that they know not. Only this will make them abandon their natural apathy. (*Catechese e civilização dos indigenas*, 687)

Campos’s primary motive was to transform Jê foragers into sedentary laborers oriented toward market production and consumption, and he elaborated numerous policy proposals to this effect. Crown officials saw through the thinly disguised personal ambitions that motivated these recommendations, and Campos gained little in the way of personal power or profit.²⁷

A third priest, Padre Manuel de Jesus Maria (1731–1811) ministered for a half-century to Corado, Coropó, and Puri Indians in southeastern Minas Gerais. The Coroados (“crowned ones”) were so named because of the hairstyle used by the men—they shaved or plucked the top of their heads, leaving a fringe beneath, much like a crown or a European monk’s tonsure. They were thereby reduced to a visual cue, much like how the “Botocudos” were identified by their use of *botoques*. Portuguese observers offered no

means to distinguish Coroados and Coropós, and the second may merely be a linguistic corruption of the first.²⁸ Compared to the so-called Botocudos, the Coroados and Coropós were more willing to adopt farming and permanent settlement in state-sponsored missions. The Portuguese ascribed Puri identity to those that used violence to protect their autonomy.

Padre Maria's long tenure among the Coroados, Coropós, and Puris did not yield much in the way of ethnographic writing. His humble status and parochial education were likely contributing factors. He was the son of a Portuguese man and an Angolan slave woman, ordained in 1765 after a decade-long struggle to overcome the impediments of racial mixture and illegitimate birth. Padre Maria's willingness to minister to native peoples in a frontier region enabled him to enjoy a level of social mobility that would otherwise have been difficult for an illegitimate mulatto to obtain.²⁹ In 1765 Padre Maria created Minas Gerais's first state-sponsored mission (*aldeia*) between the Peixe and Pomba Rivers, an opportunity facilitated by the expulsion of the Jesuit order from Brazil in 1759.

Padre Maria described Jê peoples to the extent that they conformed to or diverged from the normative prescriptions of church and state. For example, parish baptismal records for 1,033 Jê converts recorded between 1767 and 1793 document fictive kinship networks with Portuguese settlers.³⁰ Baptismal godparents typically were high status individuals—prominent landowners, military officers, and even the captaincy governor, who could provide access to resources within the Portuguese world.³¹ While we cannot know what the baptismal ritual meant spiritually to Jê converts, the relationships that developed with influential members of Portuguese society are clear. For example, Corodo leader Leandro Francisco Pires Farinho selected landowner and Indian director Francisco Pires Farinho as his godparent in 1768. Farinho, in turn, supported Leandro in his petition for the rank of captain from the Portuguese Crown. Captain Leandro's brother, Manuel, selected as godparent Alexandre da Silva Guimarães, the mulatto corporal posted at Cuieté.³²

Baptized indigenous male leaders received outward markers of their status within colonial society, such as formal letters of investiture and insignia, Portuguese clothing, tools, and other items. Unlike *caciques*, who relied primarily on their traditional authority within native societies, "captains," endorsed by Crown authorities, derived status from both the colonial and indigenous worlds and could further reinforce those dual claims to authority by serving as godparents to other natives. The Crown, in exchange for symbolic titles and perquisites, acquired military and administrative services from these captains at little or no cost.³³

The Coroados and Coropós that entered into the documentary record were those who most readily accommodated Portuguese institutions and

norms. Perhaps the most distinctive example is a Coroado Indian who took the baptismal name of Pedro da Mota. Pedro began pursuing ordination in 1779 and, like Padre Maria, had to overcome the impediments of illegitimacy and non-European descent. Manuel da Mota Andrade, his godfather and a prominent slaveowner of Portuguese birth, sponsored Pedro's religious education and provided the requisite dowry. In 1781, Padre Mota first appears in the parish records of Rio Pomba as both baptismal godparent and officiant. By 1784, he was presiding over extreme unction and burials of Portuguese settlers and slaves.³⁴

Pedro da Mota embodied Portuguese hopes that baptized natives would seek religious instruction and convert their as yet unassimilated brethren. A number of European travelers told the story of Padre Mota as a cautionary tale, alleging that he had abandoned his faith and retreated to the forest—a perfect illustration of the supposed inconstancy of native peoples. However, the discovery of Mota's last testament demonstrates the conventions that one would expect of a pious Portuguese subject at the time of his death in 1785. He left instructions for Christian burial arrangements, including masses to be said for his soul, repayment of his patron's dowry, and bequests for his brother.³⁵

Padre Maria's actions in the Rio Pomba region made native peoples both more and less legible to historians. In one instance, he facilitated a petition to the Crown by two baptized soldiers who requested the privilege of self-governance to better protect their land claims. Although this and subsequent appeals authored by Coroado and Coropó neophytes were denied, they offer a rare glimpse of Jê protagonists.³⁶ In contrast, most indigenous converts tended to fade from view as they assimilated into the Portuguese world. For example, in 1768 a Coropó took the baptismal name Joaquim Meneses, the surname reflecting his godparent, Governor Meneses. Over the next few decades, Joaquim appeared regularly as a baptismal sponsor to indigenous kin. However, a letter of patent confirming his rank as sergeant did not indicate his indigenous status and nor did subsequent documentation. This reclassification might have reflected Joaquim's choice or it might have been externally imposed.³⁷ Documentary fragments from this native parish do not permit a nuanced evaluation of changing notions of individual or community identity, unlike studies of *aldeias* conducted elsewhere.³⁸

Modernizing Perspectives

More ethnographically detailed sources about Jê speakers emerged at the very end of the century. This development reflects the formation of

transnational intellectual networks of scientists influenced by Enlightenment thought. The establishment of learned societies and state sponsorship of scientific expeditions are manifestations of this trend. Scholars have highlighted the expansionist and commercial implications of European cataloguing of American flora and fauna.³⁹ However, Brazilian local actors also participated in these processes. Pedro M. P. Raposo, Ana Simões, Manolis Patiniotis, and José R. Bertomeu-Sánchez remind us that intellectual “centres and peripheries must be regarded as co-constructed and mutually dependent entities that can change with time, and not tokens of a steady, hierarchical geography.”⁴⁰ Figures excluded from the more canonical histories of the Enlightenment also contributed to the production and circulation of scientific knowledge.

Graduates of the reformed Coimbra University in Portugal were among the first to subject Brazil to a more overtly scientific gaze.⁴¹ For example, Bishop Azeredo Coutinho’s *Ensaio económico sobre o comércio de Portugal e suas colónias* (1797) offered an analysis of Jê peoples based on early chronicles of New Spain, Peru, and Brazil and informed by Montesquieu’s geographical determinism. The balance of his discussion was regionally grounded, reflecting the experience of his grandfather, Domingos Alvares Pessanha, and maternal uncle, Padre Angelo Pessanha. Both had been involved with the “pacification” of various Jê-speaking peoples, including the Goitacá, Coropó, Coroadó, and Cuieté in southeastern Minas Gerais and the neighboring captaincy of Campos de Goitacazes. The bishop provided details about trade relations, migrations, and conflicts sustained by Jê speakers in their interactions with the Portuguese.⁴²

A Coimbra degree, however, did not necessarily inspire ethnographic writing. Governor Antonio Pires da Silva Pontes, a mineiro appointed as governor of the adjacent captaincy of Espírito Santo in 1800, graduated from Coimbra in 1777 with a degree in mathematics. He was also a member of the Lisbon Academy of Sciences. From 1780 to 1790 he explored and mapped Brazil’s principal rivers and its western territorial boundaries. Silva Pontes made commercial integration of Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo the centerpiece of his administration. In 1800 he surveyed the Doce River as a means to connect the two captaincies and recommended militarization to contain the thousands of Jê speakers residing there. Silva Pontes depicted Jê peoples as obstacles to be contained, not people to be analyzed.⁴³

Professional military officers would prove to be the most consistent source of ethnographic information from the turn of the nineteenth century onward. Among the first was José da Silva Brandão (1751–1831), a cavalry officer who entered military service around 1770. He served at the Conquest of Arrepiados and in the Serra do Frio, where he was involved in the

suppression of the contraband diamond trade.⁴⁴ In 1799 he convinced a group of eighty-one Kumanaxó, Kamaraxó, Pañâme, Maxakali, and Kopoxó, under the leadership of two “chiefs” named José and Alexandre, to settle at a site called Tocoios. Given the names of its leaders and its multiethnic composition, this group might have originated from the *aldeia* of Laranjeiras, near Cuieté.⁴⁵

Brandão sent to the *mineiro* governor, Bernardo José de Lorena, numerous handcrafted indigenous items, including gourd vessels, pestles, personal grooming tools, pots, firemaking tools, food, hammocks, polished longbows, and several types of arrows decorated with distinctive markings representing specific kin groups. Sacks made of *embira* (a native plant) fiber or cotton thread doubled as fishing nets for shallow waters.⁴⁶ Brandão also provided one of the earliest ethnographically detailed descriptions of Jê speakers, albeit of native peoples that probably had been interacting regularly with Portuguese settlers for some time. He described physical appearance, body ornamentation, material life, and cultural practices that transcended the generic.

Brandão’s assessment of Jê cultural and spiritual practices was somewhat dismissive. He disapproved of their gendered division of labor, observing that Jê women were so physically overburdened that they were stooped by the time they reached adulthood. He found monotonous the singing and dancing that accompanied nocturnal dances to appease the spirits of the dead. He described supernatural beliefs that associated woodpeckers, panthers, and snakes with good or ill fortune as well as worship of a superior being, recorded by Brandão as *Tupã*, the word used for God in the generic form of Tupi used by missionaries. It is likely that Brandão was formally educated. Two of his brothers also attained the rank of brigadier, a third was ordained as a priest, and one of his sons would pursue a mathematics degree at Coimbra.⁴⁷ Moreover, the form of Brandão’s narrative and his cataloguing of native artifacts conform to recommendations made in *Breves instruções aos correspondentes da Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa* (1781).⁴⁸

Gui Marlière: Soldier-Ethnographer

In 1808, Dom João VI declared war against the Botocudos; the conflict that would last until 1831.⁴⁹ The Crown deployed seven military divisions throughout the eastern half of Minas Gerais to “pacify” native peoples and to open the area for settlement by the Portuguese. As the war progressed, physical protection and economic benefits were extended to Jê speakers who were willing to settle in state-sponsored *aldeias*, adopt agriculture, and live in

peace with Portuguese “colonists.” Those that refused suffered violence and enslavement.⁵⁰ For good or ill, more frequent interactions ensued among Jê peoples, Portuguese settlers, soldiers, officials, and foreign travelers.

The war produced a keen observer and chronicler of Jê peoples. Gui (Guido) Tomás Marlière (1769–1836) was a French soldier who had served for fifteen years under various French factions before enlisting in the Portuguese army in 1802, at age thirty-three.⁵¹ He married into a well-connected Franco-Portuguese family and, in 1807, accompanied the royal family as it fled Napoleon’s forces and reestablished the Portuguese Crown government in Brazil.⁵² Marlière’s initial post was São João Batista, a presidio adjoining Padre Maria’s indigenous parish. He soon became an advocate for the partially acculturated Coroados, Coropós, and Puris, as reflected in his attempts to protect native land rights and to shield indigenous communities from arbitrary acts of violence perpetuated by settlers and rival tribes. Marlière quickly gained the approval of his superiors and advanced rapidly within the Doce River Divisions, attaining the rank of colonel and the position of general Indian director by 1824.

Marlière came to believe that the most efficient and least costly route to a lasting peace combined nonviolent negotiation, state protection, and gradual social and economic integration of Jê peoples within state-sponsored *aldeias*. His more humane approach was consistent with that articulated by statesman José Bonifácio de Andrade e Silva, who had presented an indigenous policy proposal to the Constituent Assembly in 1823, emphasizing tutelage within state-sponsored *aldeias*.⁵³ Bonifácio’s recommendations were not incorporated into the 1824 constitution; however, Marlière admired them and tried to implement them.⁵⁴ To this end, he learned indigenous languages, traveled widely, and wrote thousands of pages of correspondence to government officials, European scientists, and Brazilian newspapers.⁵⁵

While Marlière claimed “my tormented youth, begun in the tumult of combat and revolutions, did not give me time to frequent lycées,” his writings suggest that he was well versed in history, philosophy, and literature and could read French, English, German, and Portuguese.⁵⁶ He cited notable figures in the history of indigenous policy in the Americas, including Bartolomé de Las Casas, José de Anchieta, Manuel de Nóbrega, and William Penn. He also drew inspiration from military histories of Russia, Asia, ancient Greece, and Rome, as well as French Enlightenment texts by Voltaire and Diderot.⁵⁷

Most of Marlière’s ethnographic writings were published in 1824 and 1825, in the *Abelha do Itaculumy* (the *Itaculumy Bee*) and its successor, *O Universal*, the only newspapers in Minas Gerais at that time. Marlière

contributed twenty-nine items about native peoples to the *Abelha* over its two-year existence, appearing in slightly over 10 percent of the paper's issues. He wrote four additional essays for *O Universal* in 1825, after which his ethnographic contributions diminished. These writings are among the first detailed ethnographic descriptions of the Botocudo published in any language. Preceding Marlière were publications by Ludwig Wilhelm von Eschwege, a mining engineer who spent a decade in Brazil, and Prince Maximilian of Wied-Neuwied.⁵⁸ Marlière influenced these and later accounts by providing information, arranging for Jê guides and interpreters, and facilitating travel arrangements for European travelers to visit semiacculturated Jê communities.⁵⁹ His collaboration is particularly evident in an account written by Eschwege. While Eschwege also had personal contact with Jê peoples, he frequently credited Marlière as an informant and included lengthy transcribed and paraphrased reports written by the Frenchman.⁶⁰

Languages

Marlière considered mastery of native languages essential to establishing an enduring peace. Consequently, he learned a number of dialects, employed numerous translators, and published four essays about indigenous languages in the *Abelha*. The lead article enumerated 110 words and phrases, addressing basic syntax and grammatical categories such as pronouns, adverbs of place, distance and time, affirmatives and negatives, and comparatives, as well as vocabulary dealing with parts of the body, kinship relations, flora and fauna, weather and natural elements, weaponry, and common adjectives. He noted that counting was limited to one, two, and many, and he lamented his limited ability to portray the language's formal structure, particularly verb conjugations.⁶¹

The remaining three articles were essentially alphabetized vocabulary lists, taking up approximately 40–50 percent of the copy of three four-page issues.⁶² In all, Marlière documented 293 words and simple expressions. The single largest category was parts of the body (including genitalia) and basic bodily functions, including defecation, urination, and sexual intercourse (40 terms in all). He included words for common foodstuffs, for God and the Devil, and for items of Portuguese origin. The language involved the use of compound elements and appears to have been quite adaptable as the Botocudo devised their own terms for windows, tiles, sugar, hoes, scythes, machetes, cigars, salt, firearms, and beds (the same word as canoe). The only obvious loan words from Portuguese were dog (*cão*) and flour (*porinha*, from the Portuguese *farinha*). Their word for mulatto meant "red hide."

An analysis of this material coupled with a more extensive unpublished dictionary of over 800 “Botocudo” words suggests some intriguing clues about Portuguese ethnonyms.⁶³ For example, *Naknenuk*, used to describe Jê speakers who lived north of the Doce River, loosely translated means “this land is mine” with *nak* meaning “land,” *nhuk* meaning “my” or “mine,” and “to be” implied in the compound. Similarly *Krenak* also implied territorial possession, with *kré* meaning “here” and *nak* meaning “land,” or “this land here.” Possibly the word might derive from *gren* (what some Jê speakers used to refer to themselves) plus *nak* (“land”). *Jiporok* translated as “fierce.” *Puri* simply meant “forest dweller.”⁶⁴ These ethnonyms might reflect simple misunderstandings: imagine a Portuguese soldier asking, “What is your name?” with the native group responding, “This land is ours!” *Jiporok* might have entered Portuguese usage as an epithet spoken by a rival group, much as the Tupis had classified Jê speakers as Tapuias.

The names that Jê speakers assigned to Portuguese officials are also revealing. Marlière was called Captain Paquejú (a name assigned to influential chiefs). Captain Lizardo of the fourth military division was Gine-Kuén-Kuen, “he of the pock-marked nose.” The trigger-happy Corporal Carneiro at the Cuieté barracks was called Shompeik (fire or gunfire). Petersdorff, a state-sponsored *aldeia*, was called Krahy-té-wine, “Lies of the Portuguese.”⁶⁵ Curiously, key words like *slave*, *captive*, and *gold* do not appear in this lexicon. In Marlière’s unpublished dictionary, he recorded the words for adultery, menstruation, sexual intercourse, sodomy, whore, and hermaphrodite. One can only imagine the conversations that yielded this terminology. While Marlière’s linguistic contributions might seem rather modest, they are consistent in method and scope with the reports of European scientists. Most naturalists were not trained linguists, and the orthography used in their random vocabulary lists reflected the conventions of their own native tongues. This kind of unsystematically collected, fragmentary, and transcribed data is all that linguists have at their disposal to attempt to reconstruct Jê languages that now are all but extinct.⁶⁶

Jê History and Culture

Marlière’s serialized “News of the Botocudos” began by asking if the Botocudo were naturally inclined toward cannibalism or if a history of unwarranted aggression was to blame.⁶⁷ As a reputation for cannibalism was justification for the 1808 declaration of war, this was no idle inquiry. It was also a remarkable attempt to historicize this practice instead of adopting a culturally essentialist stance. After citing numerous atrocities, including those perpetrated against children and the elderly, Marlière cast

blame on the Portuguese, concluding, “If the cause of the Indians were placed before the Tribunal of Humanity, we would certainly pay the legal costs.” Here he echoed Diderot’s notion of humanity as the best judge of the common good and laws to ensure it. For Marlière, the common good was best served through negotiation and gift exchange, as was evident in his conclusion: “It is better to spill pennies than blood.”⁶⁸

Marlière contextualized indigenous use of violence as defense of territorial claims that were necessary to survival. Small groups occasionally united under the leadership of a superior chief to confront a stronger adversary. Conflicts also could be resolved through intimidation and payment of Portuguese-manufactured clothing and tools as tribute.⁶⁹ Gift exchange and the occasional offer of a hostage served as the prelude to peace negotiations.⁷⁰ Marlière’s understanding of Jê political organization led him to attempt to co-opt native leaders by offering titles, military uniforms, weapons, and tools, thereby hoping to negotiate a lasting peace. These interventions sometimes disrupted the balance of power among native peoples and fueled intra-tribal violence. For example, one of his most loyal allies, Pokrane, used weapons supplied by the Brazilian military to seek revenge on his rivals.⁷¹ Marlière’s constant distribution of gifts might also have been understood by indigenous leaders as payment of tribute and recognition of their authority.

Marlière’s observations of gender relations were consistent with Brando’s observations at Tocoios. The productive activities of men and women complemented one another, each contributing to the survival of the group as a whole. Men hunted, cleared land, and engaged in combat. Women, Marlière opined, were “veritable beasts of burden” who carried food, utensils, pots and pans, firewood, water, knives and axes, as well as small children. They raised children, processed food, manufactured craft goods, and maintained the thatched roofs of their semipermanent dwellings. In Marlière’s view, the heavy physical burdens endured by the women were detrimental to their health and resulted in frequent miscarriages. He also believed that the practice of polygamy, mostly on the part of chiefs, served to depress fertility rates.⁷²

Much of the early nineteenth-century canonical travel literature also depicts Jê women as socially subordinate, citing the practice of polygamy by powerful men and scarification of adulterous wives.⁷³ A division commander provided a brief description of a Puri custom that resembles the *wai’á*, or ritualized group rape still observed among some Jê groups in western Brazil in the mid-twentieth century.⁷⁴ Numerous European travelers, perhaps conflating nudity with sexual availability, asserted that Jê women became sexually active at a very young age. Eschwege commented

that girls began sexual activity as young as age eight, “led solely by instinct, like animals.”⁷⁵ Auguste de Saint-Hilaire claimed that Coroado women “had amorous relations as indiscreet as those of animals,” and that their sexual participation was akin to drinking water to satisfy thirst.⁷⁶

However, both Marlière and Eschwege went beyond representations of unremitting toil and sexual submission. They also recorded opportunities for social and spiritual power for Coroado and Puri women. So too did Georg Freyreiss, a botanist who gained access to a Coroado village through Marlière. They observed women practicing healing rituals such as the use of hot stones to draw out infection; application of human saliva, bleeding, and cold baths to combat fevers; the draining of abscesses or tumors; and the use of medicinal plants. Mature women could distinguish themselves through skilled oratory.⁷⁷

While parents typically arranged the marriages of their daughters at relatively young ages, widows and orphans could choose their own spouses. Married women could initiate divorce.⁷⁸ The Frenchman also documented sexually explicit lyrics composed by Botocudo women during ritual dances performed to honor their Creator God or to celebrate battles or ancestors, qualifying images of timid, slavish Jê women. In one, an unmarried woman asks a young man, “You who say I’m ugly, why do you come at night after my fire is lit, and slowly climb on my back?” Marlière informs the reader that such actions could imply an offer of marriage. Another verse offered by the wife of Captain Nhó-ene was overtly sexual: “I can’t dance anymore. I’m sitting down. My *kijóh* (vagina) is sweaty, and it’s already crying out.”⁷⁹

Marlière also recorded Jê attitudes toward death, disease, and misfortune. “Botocudos” attributed ill fortune to human selfishness or the deliberate malevolence of their enemies.⁸⁰ Following a death, Jê peoples might kill a member of an enemy tribe, thereby fueling a cycle of revenge. The unappeased dead were believed to cause disease, misfortune, or death and required elaborate rituals. Unlike many foreign observers who belittled Jê rituals as “monotonous” and “lacking a higher purpose,”⁸¹ both Marlière and Eschwege described structured burials, fasting, speeches, and lamentations. Coroados took pains to retrieve fallen comrades and enemies and to bury them as quickly as possible so malevolent spirits like Nantshone (translated as “the Devil” by missionaries) could not steal their spirits. Shamans communicated with souls of the deceased and appeased ghosts and apparitions. Some Coroados even ritually buried Guido Marlière’s dog after it had been killed and partially eaten by wild pigs; they also incorporated Christian elements like a cross on the grave.⁸²

The Coroados historically mummified dead chiefs in large earthen jars but were abandoning this custom in Marlière’s day. It may be that decades

of exposure to Christian doctrine had occasioned this shift.⁸³ The Botocudo adorned male corpses with a cap and a knife suspended around the neck. The cadaver was then bound and secured with thick cords around the neck to a stake or tree. The group's most valiant warriors guarded the body until it was interred. Grave goods consisted of food, water, and useful tools: honey and weapons for men and cooking pots for women. A house, larger and more durable than ordinary dwellings, was then constructed over the grave. Around the hut, squashes, manioc, and corn were planted. For some days after the burial, perishable grave goods were renewed and small fires were tended to comfort the corpse. Upon leaving the site the deceased's kin would burn the forest cover to the east to allow the sun to enter.⁸⁴

These practices offer potential insights into why Jê speakers might have rejected settled agriculture. Contemporary scholars have associated a propensity to trek with the construction of adult masculinity and to avoid cohabitation with the dead. Marlière suggested that farming also bore some resemblance to death rituals. Jê peoples cleared land and planted crops to bury the dead and then abandoned the area. Marlière reported in one instance that some Indians had used a plot of land cleared by soldiers as a burial site.⁸⁵ Additionally, their beliefs about the afterlife posited that the cowardly and lazy were relegated to arid barren lands exposed to a scorching sun. The virtuous went to a virgin forest abundant in fruits, game, water, and fish.⁸⁶

Indigenous Humanity

Compared to contemporaneous narratives published for an international audience, Marlière's writing is striking in its humanism. He represented natives as distinct individuals, highlighting admirable character traits. He wrote of their generosity, observing that hunters were required to give their game to others, lest they never hit their target in the future. Marlière frequently documented examples of emotional tenderness, kindness, and personal honor among natives of his acquaintance. He wrote of Merangang, one of Chief Pó-atú's wives, who had gone blind. She refused Marlière's offer of charity, instead using her six-year-old son as her guide. He documented the deaths of indigenous friends from European diseases. These included Hagemm (*sapucaia* leaf), Hagemm's wife Gemm-tane (broken leaf), Captain Jacú, his wife Punang, and their son Kijame, who buried his parents with ritual honors, before succumbing himself. While these accounts are laden with sentimentality—of lovers united as they face death and a son's devotion to his parents, they transcend simple typologies.

Marlière also used individual names, rather than presenting Indians as undifferentiated savages, even to the point of publishing errata to add names after the fact. In one article he spoke of a warrior who, when faring badly in a battle with some soldiers, disarmed, scaled a tree, and proudly exposed his chest to his adversaries in a gesture of bravado. Marlière felt it important to follow up a few months later with his name, Makuéen.⁸⁷ In another he clarified in a footnote that Captain D'Ió Ima's name should not be mistaken for João (Portuguese for John).⁸⁸ He translated the names of indigenous youths who were to attend a seminary as follows: José Ponamgrán ("facial defect"), José Haûme ("the burned one"), Lino Bokeûne-Tainuk ("he who doesn't kill little birds"), Ik-nük ("he who doesn't snore"), and Krène-mang ("hair cropped short").⁸⁹ He provided the names of four leaders disposed to permanent settlement: Gipuquitura (he whose earlobes extend to the nape of the neck), Minuca, Iuquipó, and Vão-paquejú.⁹⁰

Individuality and essential humanity are also evident in a biographical sketch that Marlière published about Captain Paquejú-Orotinón, with whom he enjoyed a kind of fictive kinship, as Há-gemm, Marlière's adopted son, was Orotinón's son-in-law. Orotinón had been instrumental in the creation of a native settlement called Petersdorff where some three hundred Botocudos resided. He referred to himself as "Lord of the lands of the Doce River and its tributaries," suggesting that he did not see this arrangement as a form of capitulation to the Portuguese.⁹¹ Among his other demands, he required Marlière's men to build him a secure, permanent residence.⁹²

Marlière described Orotinón as in his early forties, physically robust with a "noble and animated face," an unflappable demeanor, and a kingly bearing. When the Frenchman hosted Orotinón and his family to a full dinner with wine, Orotinón "carried out his role like any European gastronome." At another meal Orotinón sat at the table with the aggressive Captain Quitóte. He had his bow strung and arrows at the ready, which among Botocudos was both a courtesy and an implied threat. Orotinón got up from the table, released the bowstring, bound up the arrows, and calmly returned to his dinner.⁹³

Conclusion

Why did Marlière write both ethnographically and humanistically? What did he hope to accomplish? Three possibilities come to mind. The first is that Marlière wished to sway public opinion about indigenous policy. The second is that his cosmopolitanism, interaction with other European intellectuals, and his exposure to Enlightenment ideas caused him to see

native peoples differently and to perceive value in writing about them. The third, related to the second, is that ethnographic writing offered the opportunity to participate in a transatlantic lettered community.

In 1824, Marlière was appointed commander and indigenous director of the Rio Doce. This provided an opportunity to combat abuses long perpetuated by the Portuguese including unprovoked ambushes, beheadings, the collection of ears as trophies, deliberate attempts to infect natives with disease, theft of Indian lands, labor exploitation, corporal punishment, enslavement, sexual abuse, and swindling.⁹⁴ His newspaper writings in the *Abelha* and *O Universal* explicitly critiqued these practices. Marlière instead prioritized the pacification of the “Botocudos” occupying the Doce River basin, a waterway then seen as a source of untapped commercial potential. He favored negotiated alliances and gift exchange as the basis for peace, a policy that would likely be economical in the long term but expensive in the short term. A humanized, culturally nuanced portrait of native peoples might garner support for these policy recommendations.

If Marlière’s primary motivation were intellectual prestige, publication in Rio-based periodicals would have reached a wider audience. But Marlière wrote for local papers, further supporting the interpretation that influencing local opinion was his primary goal. One wonders why the editors published so much arcane material, especially those lengthy indigenous vocabulary lists. In fact, Marlière expressed concern over audience reception, although one anonymous fan letter was published in the *Abelha*.⁹⁵ In one issue he wrote, “I know that many of my readers are uninterested in hearing tales of the inherent virtues of these sons of Nature, whom they despise as the Israelites did the uncircumcised.”⁹⁶ In another, he voiced fears that his frequent articles about Indians were causing the *Abelha*’s subscribers indigestion.⁹⁷

Marlière’s participation in a transatlantic community of letters expanded as he entered into direct contact with distinguished European scientists who traveled to Brazil following the lifting of restrictions for non-Portuguese subjects in 1808. He later entered into public scholarly dialogue with Baron Eschwege and Auguste de Saint-Hilaire. In print, he praised Eschwege’s precise survey of the Doce River and translated passages of his *Journal von Brasilien* (1818) for a Portuguese audience.⁹⁸ He also published in the *Abelha* a letter he had written to Saint-Hilaire, a prestigious botanist, critiquing one of his manuscripts.⁹⁹ Saint-Hilaire’s research had been funded by the French Ministry of the Interior, and he was inducted into the Académie des Sciences in 1830.¹⁰⁰ Marlière’s correctives encompassed native terminology, the history of local missions, definitions of tribal territorial claims, and the practice of polygamy. How Saint-Hilaire responded to this

critique is unknown; an essay resembling the manuscript was published in France in 1829.¹⁰¹

Marlière's biographers have tended to portray him as a precocious paragon of humanitarian modern virtues. Such hagiographies are neither useful nor accurate. While Marlière acted as advocate, public intellectual, and cultural interlocutor for Jê speakers, he also implemented policies that, when carried to their fullest conclusion, resulted in the demise of Jê cultures, languages, and autonomy.¹⁰² Perhaps he did not think through the long-term implications of these policies. Marlière chose to spend his final years at his rural estate among the Coroados. A month before his death, he asked them to dig a tomb for him on top of a hill at the foot of a Braúna tree, near an old Coroado cemetery. He died on 5 June 1836 and was buried upright seated on his favorite chair with wine and bread at his feet, blending Coroado and European burial customs.¹⁰³

Of noncanonical intellectuals like Marlière, a recent essay states, "The end result for these actors is that when they disappear physically, any notoriety they may have achieved while living, vanishes into thin air."¹⁰⁴ In Marlière's case, faint traces remained. In the Arquivo Pùblico Mineiro, a typed manuscript by naturalist Manuel Basílio Furtado, who traveled through Jê territory in Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo in 1873, reproduces a passage from an article published by Marlière nearly half a century before.¹⁰⁵ Augusto de Lima, editor of the *Revista do Arquivo Pùblico Mineiro* published hundreds of pages of Marlière's transcribed documents in the volumes of 1905, 1906, and 1907. Oral traditions about Marlière still circulated seven decades after his death, providing material for Afranio de Melo Franco's 1914 biography. These traces, preserved in archival and digital form, enable both the ethnohistorical reconstruction of Jê peoples and a greater understanding of how peripheral intellectuals contributed to the production and circulation of knowledge.

Notes

- 1 Today, the twelve Jê ethnicities that are legally recognized in Minas Gerais constitute approximately 11,000 people and Jê dialects are nearly extinct. Lima, "As comunidades indígenas."
- 2 The historian, therefore, cannot rely on ecclesiastical, notarial, or court records that undergird the ethnohistory of much of Iberian America.
- 3 Dean, *With Broadax and Firebrand*; Monteiro, *Negros da terra*.
- 4 Schwartz, "Indian Labor and New World Plantations."
- 5 Raminelli, *Colonizaçäo*.
- 6 Monteiro, "Heathen Castes."
- 7 José, *Indigenas de Minas Gerais*, 13–37.
- 8 Rodrigues, "Os sertões proibidos da Mantiqueira," 254.

9 Resende, “Gentios Brasílicos.”

10 Venâncio, “Os últimos carijós.”

11 Langfur, *Forbidden Lands*.

12 Biblioteca Nacional Rio de Janeiro (hereafter BNRJ), Seção de Manuscritos (SM), Coleção Otoni (CO), códice (cód.) 18, 2, 6, fols. 985–95 (1765).

13 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fols. 927 (1969), 1062 (1770), and 1349 (n.d., ca. 1768–69); fols. 947 (1769), 965 (1768), 967 (n.d., ca. 1768), 1263 (1770), 1447 (1769); fols. 1001 (1768) and 1490 (ca. 1769); fols. 907–8, 941, 1557 (1769).

14 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fol. 937 (1769).

15 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fols. 1382–1385 (1769), fol. 1053 (1770).

16 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fol. 923 (1769).

17 Bieber, “Borders and Rivers.”

18 Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino, Lisbon, Portugal (hereafter AHU) CU 05 01, caixa (cx.) 34, document (doc.) 6, 429 (1764).

19 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fol. 1410 (1768), fols. 1136–61 (1770), fols. 1346–51, (ca. 1768), fols. 1479, 1481–83 (1769), fols. 1053, 1083 (1770), fols. 1262–72 (1770), fols. 1499–1500 (1769).

20 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fol. 923 (1769).

21 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fols. 1501–3 (1769), fols. 1523–25 (1770).

22 Similar to dynamics described in White, *Middle Ground*; Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*; and Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*.

23 BNRJ, SM, CO, cód. 18, 2, 6, fols. 1489–95 (ca. 1769).

24 AHU Minas Gerais (hereafter MG), cx. 16, doc. 73 (1730); AHU, MG, cx. 152, doc. 20 (1800); AHU, MG, cx. 158, doc. 5 (1801).

25 AHU, MG, cx. 152, doc. 20 (1800).

26 *Revista do Arquivo Pública Mineiro* (1897), “Catechese e civilização,” 694.

27 AHU, MG, cx. 159, doc. 38 (1801); cx. 160, doc. 80 (1801).

28 Luft, “Da história à pré-história,” 49–55.

29 AHU, MG, cx. 78, doc. 9 (1761); cx. 90, doc. 55 (1767); cx. 101, doc. 67 (1771); cx. 112, doc. 67 (1776); cx. 123, doc. 62 (n.d.); cx. 149, doc. 62 (1799); Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 76–77; Paiva, *Indígenas*, 38, 44–64.

30 Paiva, *Indígenas*, 71.

31 AHU, MG, cx. 175, doc. 19 (1805); BNRJ Casa dos Contos (hereafter CC), I-26, 20, 044 (1789); Paiva, *Indígenas*, 111–19, 125–26, 135–45.

32 Paiva, *Indígenas*, 139–43.

33 Ibid., 109–26.

34 AHU, MG, cx. 112, doc. 51 (1778); cx. 118, doc. 95 (1782); Paiva, *Indígenas*, 79–82.

35 Paiva, *Indígenas*, 92–102.

36 Ibid., 152–56; AHU, MG, cx. 123, doc. 62 (1785); AHU, MG, cx. 132, doc. 32 (1790).

37 Paiva, *Indígenas*, 126–27.

38 Sommer, “Negotiated Settlements”; Roller, *Amazonian Routes*; and Almeida, *Metamorfozes Indígenas*. For a mineiro example from a slightly later period, see Mattos, *Civilização e Revolta*.

39 First popularized by Mary Louise Pratt in *Imperial Eyes*. For an overview of canonical Brazilian travel narratives, see Belluzzo, *O Brasil dos viajantes*.

40 Raposo et al., “Moving Localities and Creative Circulation,” 168.

41 Domingues, *Viagens de exploração*, 19–32; Ronald Raminelli, *Viagens ultramarinas*.

42 Azaredo Coutinho, *Ensaio económico*, 31–65.

43 AHU, ACL, CU 011, cx. 134, doc. 32 (1790); AHU, Espírito Santo cx. 6, docs. 438, 441, 442, 444, 449 (1800), and 460 (1801); Daemon, *Província do Espírito Santo*, 203–6, 213, 233.

44 AHU, MG, cx. 159, doc. 39 (1801); AHU, MG, cx. 160, doc. 127 (1801); cx. 166, doc. 40 (1803); cx. 168, doc. 48 (1803); cx. 172, doc. 13 (1804); *Revista do Arquivo Público Mineiro* (1897), “Botocudos ou Aymores.”

45 AHU, MG, cx. 148, doc. 46 (1799).

46 AHU, MG, cx. 148, doc. 46 (1799).

47 Trindade, *História dos Brandões—Quarta Parte*, 175–6; RAPM, 1905, 469; “O Brigadeiro.”

48 *Breves instruções aos correspondentes da Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa*, 41–45.

49 Cunha, *Legislação*, 57–60, 137.

50 Ibid., 79–80, 111–14.

51 *Revista do Arquivo Público Mineiro* (1907), “Guido Thomaz Marlière (continuação),” 524.

52 José, Marlière, *O civilizador*, 12–20; *Revista do Arquivo Público Mineiro* (1906), “Guido Thomaz Marlière (notícias),” 13–26.

53 Silva, “Apontamentos para a civilização.”

54 Marlière, “Notícias dos Botocudos continuadas de n. 9.”

55 Bieber, “Catechism and Capitalism”; Bieber, “Mediation through Militarization.”

56 Marlière, “Notícias dos Botocudos”; Marlière, “Rio Doce, ‘The Deserted Village.’”

57 Marlière, Variedades, (for Penn and Las Casas); Marlière, “Notícias dos Botocudos” (for Nobrega and Anchieta); Marlière, “Notícias” (for Diderot); Marlière, “Notícias dos Botocudos continuadas de n. 9.” (for Voltaire).

58 First published as Ludwig Wilhelm von Eschwege, *Journal von Brasilien* (Weimar, 1818) and Maximilian Wied-Neuwied, *Reise nach Brasilien in den Jahren 1815–17* (Frankfurt am Main, 1821).

59 Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 87–120; Spix and Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, 197, 217, 231, 262; Freyreiss, *Viagem*, 86–87; Saint-Hilaire, *Viagem pelas províncias*, 184; Saint-Hilaire, *Viagem ao Espírito Santo e Rio Doce*, 14, 18, 83, 86, 89, 95–7, 108–9.

60 Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 91–117.

61 Marlière, “Idiomas ou Línguas dos Índios.”

62 Marlière, “Vocabulário das Tribus dos Botocudos”; Marlière, “Continuação do Vocabulário Botocudo”; Marlière, “Vocabulário Botocudo.”

63 BNRJ, 01, 1, 003. Vocabulário português-botocudo (1835).

64 BNRJ, I-46, 17, 2 (1814).

65 Marlière, “Continuação das notícias sobre os Botocudos.”

66 Seki, “Apontamentos para a bibliografia.”

67 Marlière, “Notícias sobre os Botocudos, e mais Índios da Província de Minas Gerais”; Marlière, “Notícias sobre os Botocudos continuadas do N. 135 da Abelha”; Marlière, “Continuação das notícias sobre os Botocudos”; Marlière, “Notícias dos Botocudos continuadas de N. 9.”

68 Marlière, "Notícias."

69 Marlière, "Continuação das notícias dos Botocudos."

70 Marlière, "Continuação das notícias sobre os Botocudos," 232.

71 Aguiar, "Apontamentos sobre a vida," 428–9.

72 Marlière, "Rio Doce. Continuação das notícias sobre dos Botocudos"; Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 100, 105.

73 Wied-Neuwied, *Viagem ao Brasil*, 307.

74 Cited by Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 85. On the wa'ia see Maybury-Lewis, *Akwe-Shavante Society*, 44–48; Garfield, *Indigenous Struggle at the Heart of Brazil*, 121–29.

75 Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 105.

76 Saint-Hilaire, *Viagem pelas províncias*, 32–33.

77 Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 89–91, 114–15. Freyreiss, *Viagem ao interior do Brasil*, 100. Freyreiss traveled with Eschwege and Marlière to Coroado and Puri territory in 1814 and 1815. In 1815, Freyreiss joined Wied-Neuwied's expedition to northern Minas Gerais and Southern Bahia. Publication of his work was delayed until 1907; he drowned in Brazil in 1825 at age thirty five. Moraes, Smedt, and Hjertson, "Notes on the Brazilian Plants Collected by Georg Wilhelm Freyreiss," 123–24.

78 Marlière, Correspondência. Retiro."

79 Ibid.

80 Marlière, "Uso Funebres dos Botocudos"; Mattos, *Civilização e Revolta*.

81 Spix and Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, 252–3, 261.

82 Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 103; Freyreiss, *Viagem ao interior do Brasil*, 96.

83 Eschwege, *Jornal do Brasil*, 84–85, 104.

84 Marlière, "Correspondência. Retiro."

85 Marlière, "Correspondências."

86 Marlière, "Usos Funebres."

87 Marlière, "Memento."

88 Marlière, "Correspondência," March 28.

89 Marlière, "Memento."

90 Marlière, "Artigos de Officio. Minas Geraes," 17 November.

91 Marlière, "Artigos de Officio. Minas Gerais," 18 August.

92 Marlière, "Artigos de Officio. Minas Gerais," 18 August.

93 Marlière, "Variedades."

94 Marlière, "Continuação das notícias," *Revista do Arquivo Público Mineiro*, "Guido Thomaz Marlière (notícias)," 113–16.

95 Abelha do Itaculumy, "Correspondência."

96 Marlière, "Continuação."

97 Marlière, "Correspondência," 28 March.

98 Marlière, "Sobre o Rio Doce."

99 Saint-Hilaire, "Les Indiens de Passanha," 62–76. This material was incorporated into Auguste de Saint-Hilaire, *Voyage dans les provinces de Rio de Janeiro et de Minas Geraes* (1830).

100 Kury, "Auguste de Saint-Hilaire," 1–11.

101 Marlière, "Minas Gerais. Tradução de huma Carta do Tenente Coronel Director Geral ao Cavalleiro Augusto de Saint-Hilaire da Real Academia das Sciencias em Paris."

102 Aguiar, *Memórias e Historias*.

103 José, *Marlière*, 36–39; Franco, *Guido Thomaz Marlière*, 135–36, 140–41, 144, 147; Aguiar, *Memorias e historia*, 334–54, 360–61, 367.

104 Raposo et al., “Moving Localities,” 182–83.

105 Arquivo Público Mineiro, Fundo Manoel Basílio Furtado 1, cx. 1, doc. 1 (1873). Citation from Marlière, “Usos fúnebres.”

References

Abelha do Itaculumy

1824 “Artigos de Ofício. Minas Gerais.” 17 November.

1825 “Correspondência.” 17 November.

Aguiar, José Otávio

2008 *Memórias e histórias de Guido Tomás Marlière (1808–1836). A transição da Corte Portuguesa e a tortuosa trajetória de um Revolucionário Francês no Brasil*. Campina Grande, Brazil: Editora da Universidade Federal de Campina Grande.

“Apontamentos sobre a vida do indio Guido Pokrane e sobre o Francez Guido Marlière.”

1855 (Oferecido pelo socio o ex. sr. Conselheiro Luiz Pedreira Couto Ferrez). *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* 18: 426–34.

Almeida, Maria Regina Celestino de

2003 *Metamorfoses Indígenas: Identidade e cultura nas aldeias coloniais do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional.

Azaredo Coutinho, Joze Joaquim da Cunha de

1797 *Ensaio económico sobre o comércio de Portugal e suas colónias*. Lisbon: Academia Real das Ciencias.

Barr, Julianne

2007 *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Belluzzo, Ana Maria de Moraes

1994 *O Brasil dos viajantes*. São Paulo: Metalivros.

2007 “História dos Brandões—Quarta Parte.” brandoes.blogspot.com/2007/07/histria-dos-brandes-quarta-parte.html (accessed 26 July 2007).

Bieber, Judy

2014 “Catechism and Capitalism on a Brazilian Frontier.” In *Native Brazil: Beyond the Cannibal and the Convert*. Hal Langfur, ed. Pp. 166–97. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

2014 “Mediation through Militarization: Indigenous Soldiers and Transcultural Middlemen of the Rio Doce Divisions, Minas Gerais, Brazil, 1808–1850.” *The Americas* 71, no. 2: 227–54.

2016 “Borders and Rivers: Bandeiras and Native Peoples of the São Mateus, Pardo, and Jequitinhonha Rivers, 1730–1770.” Paper presented at the Brazilian Studies Association Congress, Providence, RI.

Brooks, James F.

2001 *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

1781 *Breves instruções aos correspondentes da Academia das Sciencias de Lisboa sobre as remessas dos produtos e noticias pertencentes à historia da natureza para reformar hum Museo Nacional* Lisbon: Regia Officina Typographica.

Cunha, Manuela Carneiro da, ed.

1992 *Legislação indigenista no século XIX*. São Paulo: Comissão Pró-Índio de São Paulo/Editora da USP.

Daemon, Bazilio Carvalho

1879 *Província do Espírito Santo, descoberta, historia chronologica, synopsis e estatistica*. Vitória, Brazil: Typ. do Espírito-Santense.

Dean, Warren

1995 *With Broadax and Firebrand: The Destruction of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Domingues, Ângela.

1991 *Viagens de exploração geográfica na Amazônia em finais do século XVIII: Política, ciência e aventura*. Lisbon: Instituto de História de Além-Mar.

Eschwege, Wilhelm Ludwig von

2002 *Jornal do Brasil, 1811–1817 ou relatos diversos do Brasil, coletados durante expedições científicas por Wilhelm Ludwig von Eschwege*. Friedrich E. Renger, Tarcísia Lobo Ribeiro, and Günter Augustin, trans. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Fundação João Pinheiro.

Franco, Afranio de Mello

1914 *Guido Thomaz Marlère: “O Apóstolo das Selvas Mineiras.”* Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Imprensa Official do Estado de Minas Geraes.

Freyreiss, Georg Wilhelm

1982 *Viagem ao interior do Brasil*. A. Löfgren, trans. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Editora Itatiaia.

Garfield, Seth

2001 *Indigenous Struggle at the Heart of Brazil: State Policy, Frontier Expansion, and the Xavante Indians, 1937–1988*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

José, Oliam

1958 *Marlière, O civilizador: Esboço biográfico*. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Edições Movimento-Perspectiva.

1965 *Indígenas de Minas Gerais, Aspectos Sociais, Políticos e Etnológicos*. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Editora Itatiaia.

Kury, Lorelay

2015 “Auguste de Saint-Hilaire, o viajante exemplar.” www.intellectus.uerj.br/Textos/Ano2n1/Texto%20de%20%20Lorelai%20Kury.pdf (accessed 4 December 2016).

Langfur, Hal

2006 *The Forbidden Lands: Colonial Identity, Frontier Violence, and the Persistence of Brazil's Eastern Indians, 1750–1830*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lima, Ana Paula Ferreira de n.d. “As comunidades indígenas em Minas Gerais.” Associação Nacional de Ação Indigenista. www.anai.org.br/povos_mg.asp (accessed 21 August 2015).

Luft, Vlademir José

2000 “Da história à pré-história: As ocupações das sociedades Puri e Coroado na Bacia do Alto Rio Pomba (O caso da Serra da Piedade).” PhD diss., Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Sociais/Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

Maririère, Guido Tomás

1824 “Sobre o Rio Doce.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 19 May.
 1824 Variedades. *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 2 June.
 1824 “Artigos de Oficio. Minas Geraes.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 18 August.
 1824 “Notícias dos Botocudos.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 12 November.
 1824 “Artigos de Oficio. Minas Geraes.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 17 November.
 1824 “Notícias.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 19 November.
 1824 “Notícias sobre os Botocudos, e mais Índios da Província de Minas Gerais.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 19 November.
 1824 “Notícias sobre os Botocudos continuadas do N. 135 da Abelha.”
Abelha do Itaculumy. 26 December.
 1825 “Continuação das Notícias sobre os Botocudos.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 5 January.
 1825 “Notícias dos Botocudos continuadas de N. 9.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 7 January.
 1825 “Idiomas ou Línguas dos Indios.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 9 January.
 1825 “Minas Gerais. Traducção de huma Carta do Tenente Coronel Director Geral ao Cavalleiro Augusto de Saint-Hilaire da Real Academia das Sciencias em Paris.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 17 January.
 1825 “Correspondência.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 9 February.
 1825 “Usos funebres dos Botocudos e outros Indios desta provincia, idéas religiosas, supersticões &c. Comparados com os de outros povos.”
Abelha do Itaculumy. 4 March.
 1825 “Variedades.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 7 March.
 1825 “Correspondência.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 28 March.
 1825 “Vocabulario das Tribus dos Botocudos, appelladas Krakmum, Nan-kenuk, habitantes nas Vertentes do Rio Doce e Jequitinhonha, Provincia de Minas Gerais, Império do Brasil.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 29 April.
 1825 “Continuação do Vocabulario Botocudo.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 27 May.
 1825 “Vocabulário Botocudo.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 27 May.
 1825 “Memento.” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 6 June.
 1825 “Rio Doce, ‘The Deserted Village.’” *Abelha do Itaculumy*. 15 June.
 1825 “Correspondências.” *O Universal*. 17 October.
 1825 “Correspondência. Retiro, 13 de novembro de 1825.” *O Universal*. 21 November.
 1825 “Rio Doce. Continuação das noticias sobre os Botocudos.” *O Universal*. 28 November.
 1825 “Continuação das notícias sobre os Botocudos de pag. 232.” *O Universal*. 7 December.

Mattos, Izabel Missagia de

2004 *Civilização e Revolta: Os Botocudos e a catequese na Província de Minas*. Bauru, Brazil: Editora da Universidade do Sagrado Coração.

Maybury-Lewis, David

- 1967 *Akwe-Shavante Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Maximilian Wied, Prinz von (prince of Wied-Neuwied), and Olivério M. de O. Pinto

- 1989 *Viagem ao Brasil*. Edgar Süsskind de Mendonça and Flávio Poppe de Figueiredo, trans. Brazil: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.

Monteiro, John M.

- 1994 *Negros da terra: Indios e bandeirantes nas origens de São Paulo*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- 2000 “The Heathen Castes of Sixteenth-Century Portuguese America: Unity, Diversity, and the Invention of the Brazilian Indians.” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 4: 697–720.

Moraes, Pedro Luís Rodrigues de, Sofie de Smedt, and Mats Hjertson

- 2014 “Notes on the Brazilian Plants Collected by Georg Wilhelm Freyreiss and Published by Carl Peter Thunberg in *Plantarum Brasiliensium*.” *Harvard Papers in Botany* 19, no. 1: 123–24.

Paiva, Adriano Toledo

- 2010 *Os indígenas e os processos de conquista dos sertões de Minas Gerais (1767–1813)*. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Argvmentvum.

Pratt, Mary Louise

- 1992 *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.

Raminelli, Ronald

- 1996 *Colonização: A Representação do Índio de Caminha a Vieira Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editora.
- 2008 *Viagens ultramarinas: Monarcas, vassalos e governo à distância*. São Paulo: Alameda Casa Editorial.

Raposo, Pedro M. P., Ana Simões, Manolis Patiniotis, and José R. Bertomeu-Sánchez

- 2014 “Moving Localities and Creative Circulation: Travels as Knowledge Production in Eighteenth-Century Europe.” *Centaurus* 56: 167–88.

Resende, Maria Leônia Chaves de

- 2003 “Gentios Brasílicos: Índios coloniais em Minas Gerais Setecentista.” PhD diss., Universidade de Campinas.

Revista do Arquivo Público Mineiro

- 1897 “Botocudos ou Aymores.” 2: 28–36.
- 1897 “Catechese e civilisação dos indígenas da Capitania de Minas-Geraes.” 2: 685–733.
- 1906 “Guido Thomaz Marlière (notícias e documentos sobre a sua vida).” 11: 3–254.
- 1907 “Guido Thomaz Marlière (continuação).” 12: 409–603.

Rodrigues, André Figueiredo

- 2003 “Os sertões proibidos da Mantiqueira: Desbravamento, ocupação da terra e as observações do governador Dom Rodrigo José de Meneses.” *Revista Brasileira de História* 23, no. 46: 253–70.

Roller, Heather F.

- 2014 *Amazonian Routes: Indigenous Mobility and Colonial Communities in Northern Brazil*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Saint-Hilaire, Auguste de

- 1829 “Les Indiens de Passanha, Fragment Inédit.” *Nouvelles Annales des Voyages et des Sciences Géographiques* 14: 62–76.

1974 *Viagem ao Espírito Santo e Rio Doce*. Milton Amado, trans. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Itatiaia.

1975 *Viagem pelas províncias do Rio de Janeiro e Minas Gerais*. Vivaldi Moreira, trans. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Itatiaia.

Schwartz, Stuart B.

1978 “Indian Labor and New World Plantations: European Demands and Indian Responses in Northeast Brazil.” *American Historical Review* 83, no. 1: 43–79.

Seki, Lucy

1990 “Apontamentos para a bibliografia da língua Botocudo/Borum.” *Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos* 18: 115–42.

Silva, José Bonifácio de Andrada e

1992 “Apontamentos para a civilisação dos Indios Bravos do Império do Brasil.” In *Legislação indigenista no século XIX*. Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, ed. Pp. 1–34. São Paulo: Comissão Pró-Índio de São Paulo; Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.

Sommer, Barbara A.

2000 “Negotiated Settlements: Native Amazonians and Portuguese Policy in Pará, Brazil, 1758–1798.” PhD diss., University of New Mexico.

Spix, Johann Baptist von, and Karl Friedrich Philipp von Martius

1824 *Travels in Brazil, in the Years 1817–1820*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green.

Trindade, Raimundo

1955 *Velhos troncos mineiros*. Vol. 2. São Paulo: Empréssia Gráfica da “Revista dos Tribunais.”

Venâncio, Renato Pinto

1997 “Os últimos carijós: Escravidão Indígena em Minas Gerais: 1711–1725.” *Revista Brasileira de História* 17, no. 34: 165–81.

White, Richard

1991 *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.